

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD MEETING

July 20, 2010 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Present:

Members:

Janet Langdell, Chairperson

Paul Amato

Kathy Bauer

Chris Beer

Steve Duncanson

Judy Plant

Gary Williams, Alternate Member

Staff:

Sarah Marchant, Town Planner

Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary

Meghan Bouffard, Videographer

Eric Neilson, Videographer

SCENIC ROAD HEARING:

In accordance with NH RSA 231:158, the Milford Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing at 6:30pm in the Board of Selectmen's meeting room at the Town Hall for the following:

1. **Scenic Road Hearing - Barbara Philipsen & Christopher Philipsen- Map 53, Lots 30 & 30-1;** partial removal of stonewall and potential tree removal or trimming for new common driveway on Ponemah Hill Rd.

MINUTES:

2. Approval of minutes from the 6/15/10 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

3. **Barbara Philipsen – Ponemah Hill Rd – Map 53, Lot 30.** Public hearing for a proposed subdivision creating one new residential lot. *(New application)*
4. **Richard Hillman, Jr. & Richard Hillman, Sr. – Mason Rd – Map 40, Lots 101 & 101-1.** Public hearing for a proposed common lot line adjustment. *(New application)*
5. **Paul & Nancy Amato for Spring Creek Sand & Gravel, LLC/Stonewall Dr Extension – Mile Slip Rd and Stonewall Dr – Map 45, Lot 11.** Public hearing for a proposed subdivision creating one new 43.55 acre lot. *(New application)*
6. **Paul & Nancy Amato for Spring Creek Sand & Gravel, LLC/Stonewall Dr Extension – Mile Slip Rd and Stonewall Dr – Map 45, Lot 11-1.** Public Hearing for a major open space subdivision creating fourteen (14) new residential lots. *(New application)*

OTHER BUSINESS

7. **Milford Conservation Commission – Hartshorn Pond – Map 2, lot 28-2.** Recommendation request.
8. **Suzanne Demontigny – Off Tonella Rd – Map 43, Lots 24 & 25.** Conceptual discussion for a potential residential subdivision off the end of Tonella Rd.

Chairperson Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:30PM, introduced the Board members and staff, and reviewed the agenda. C. Beer made a motion to change the order of the agenda by holding the scenic road hearing after the Philipsen subdivision application as they were interrelated. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

MINUTES:

Approval of minutes from the 6/15/10 meeting

S. Duncanson made a motion to accept the 6/15/10 minutes as submitted. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

Barbara Philipsen – Ponemah Hill Rd – Map 53, Lot 30. Public hearing for a proposed subdivision creating one new residential lot

No abutters present in the audience.

C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. J. Plant seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell noted that the application was complete, according to the staff memo. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. J. Plant seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Kevin Philipsen

Barbara Philipsen

Christopher Philipsen

K. Philipsen presented plans dated 6/24/10 and explained the proposal to subdivide a new two (2) acre lot with 200ft of frontage from the existing 6.4 acre lot. A new drainage, utility and maintenance easement will replace the existing driveway access easement on lot 53/30. The new shared twenty (20) ft common curb cut at Ponemah Hill Rd will separate out into two twelve (12) ft driveways with an 8% to 10% grade to service this new lot and lot 53/30-1. This is steep land, but the 10% grade is in line with town driveway regulations and should provide better access than what exists currently.

K. Bauer referenced the Fire Dept memo dated 7/7/10 and expressed concern with the safety issues; the equipment being able to make the turn and also with the 10% grade of the driveways. Is it possible to widen the curb cut? K. Philipsen said a wider curb cut in turn makes the driveways shorter and steeper. The curb cut would probably need to be thirty (30) ft in order to accommodate the turning radius of the fire equipment and the proposed entrance is certainly an improvement of the fifteen (15') ft existing driveway entrance. The driveways would also need to be significantly widened to make them truly accessible to fire apparatus; however, the equipment can get to the houses with this plan. G. Williams agreed that this would be a major improvement over the current driveway entrance that has a 90 degree turn. S. Duncanson requested that the driveway be widened two (2) feet to allow apparatus better access with snow on the ground. After further discussion on the width and grade, the applicant agreed to widen the gravel driveway to fourteen (14) ft. K. Bauer brought up the Code Enforcement comments regarding road frontages. S. Marchant said that was clarified also in staff recommendations, in that all frontages were clearly labeled on page #1 of the plan and a brief discussion followed.

Chairperson Langdell opened discussion to the audience; there was none and the public portion of the meeting was closed.

J. Langdell inquired if the applicant would be willing to add an additional 16.5 ft to continue the ROW dedication along lot 53/30, as granted with the two new lots, making it 25' from the centerline. K. Philipsen said it would marginally cut the lot size, but if that was something the Town felt necessary and helps the process along, they would consider doing so. J. Langdell said it would be for the greater good and given the steepness of the land it would be used for any future road maintenance and drainage. She then read staff comments... *as this is a very narrow roadway layout the additional dedication would be welcomed by the Town.* P. Amato said it would be nice to have that dedication if the Town had a plan to widen the road, but he was not aware of any plans to widen

Ponemah Hill Rd to bring it up to 25 ft. K. Bauer said not that she was of aware of any. J. Langdell agreed with Paul saying we would be asking a resident to give up something when there is no immediate need or no long term plan in place. There were no other comments from the Board. S. Marchant noted that the road width at that location was currently two rods or thirty-three ft (33') and the property line would change. K. Bauer inquired who would remove the two trees for the new driveway. S. Marchant said that the applicant will remove the trees as part of the driveway permit application process no matter who owns that portion of land and the land dedication will take effect after all the work is done.

C. Beer made a motion to grant approval subject to staff recommendations from the memo dated 7/20/10; note #9 be removed, notes be added stating lot 53/30-2 is subject to Police and Library impact fees and a Stormwater Management permit will be required, and that the written access, utility and drainage easement document be submitted for recording with the final plans and a note be added to the plan that the driveways be fourteen ft (14') wide. P. Amato seconded and all in favor.

SCENIC ROAD HEARING:

Scenic Road Hearing - Barbara Philipsen & Christopher Philipsen– Map 53, Lots 30 & 30-1; partial removal of stonewall and potential tree removal or trimming for new common driveway on Ponemah Hill Rd.

J. Langdell requested that any stones from the disturbed stonewall be re-used in a constructive fashion either as delineation or incorporated into the existing stonewall. K. Philipsen said they would.

Chairman Langdell opened discussion to the public. As there was none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

There were no comments or discussion from the Board.

S. Duncanson made a motion to grant approval to remove the marked trees and to disturb the stonewall with the condition that the stones be utilized. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

Richard Hillman, Jr. & Richard Hillman, Sr. – Mason Rd – Map 40, Lots 101 & 101-1. Public hearing for a proposed common lot line adjustment

No abutters were present in the audience.

C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell noted that the application was complete, according to the staff memo. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Richard Hillman, Jr., owner 40/101-1

Richard Hillman, Sr., owner 40/101

Elizabeth Hillman, owner 40/101

R. Hillman presented plans dated 6/21/10 and said that the original subdivision was done in 2005 when his parents gave him the land to build his house. He would like to build a shed and the most convenient location is next to the driveway across from the garage; however, it would be entirely on lot 40/101. This proposal is to adjust the lot lines to convey a portion of his parents' land to use for the shed.

J. Langdell read the staff comments from the Staff Memo dated 7/20/10.

P. Amato inquired about the Code Enforcement comments regarding a Special Exception. J. Langdell noted that the Zoning Administrator has reviewed this lot line adjustment and determined that no additional Zoning Board approvals are needed. There was no further discussion from the Board.

Chairperson Langdell opened discussion to the audience; there was none and the public portion of the hearing was closed.

C. Beer made a motion to grant final approval of the application. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor.

Paul Amato recused himself for the next two agenda items.

Paul & Nancy Amato for Spring Creek Sand & Gravel, LLC/Stonewall Dr Extension – Mile Slip Rd and Stonewall Dr – Map 45, Lot 11. Public hearing for a proposed subdivision creating one new 43.55 acre lot.

Abutters present in the audience:

Anthony Tosi, 140 Mile Slip Rd

Linda Mack, Stonewall Dr

C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell noted that the application was complete, according to the staff memo. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. G. Williams seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Matthew Peterson, Woodland Design Group, Inc.

Paul Amato, Spring Creek Gravel

M. Peterson presented sheets #1 & #2 of the plans dated 6/21/10 and gave a brief overview of the proposal to subdivide a 43.55 acre lot from the original 450 acre lot 45/11 as a precursor for the open space subdivision. This is a final application because we felt that a lot of the preliminary work has already been done; we've brought forward a conceptual in October, met with the neighbors on more than one occasion, went before Conservation and hosted a site walk for the commission. We are also requesting a waiver to not survey the entire boundary.

J. Langdell read a portion of the waiver request form. . . . *The Planning Board may grant a waiver in a special case, so that justice may be done and the public interest secured, provided that such waiver will not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purposes of these Regulations, the Zoning Ordinance or the Master Plan. The Planning Board shall not approve waivers unless it shall make findings based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case.* M. Peterson then read from the waiver request letter dated 6/21/10 . . . *Justice would be done in that the owner would not have to spend extra money and time to show the Board land that is not being effective by the development.* The large remaining parcel has pens for raising elk which are difficult to survey around or through and all the drainage runs towards the larger parcel. *The public's interest in this project would not change whether this is granted or not, because the remaining land has no bearing on this project.* There will be no gain to the public from surveying and we are not developing anything on that remaining parcel which is being stabilized so a year from now it will be different from any survey done now.

Chairperson Langdell opened discussion to the audience.

L. Mack expressed concerns with the quality of life on Stonewall Dr having the road cut through Stonewall Dr. She has been there for ten years and it's a wonderful cul-de-sac so she did not expect the road would cut up the area where fifteen or so small children play. She does not feel that there would be any value added for the good people of Stonewall Dr. J. Langdell said the comments and concerns are noted in the record and that it would be more appropriate they be taken into consideration during the next application for the open space subdivision.

The public portion of the hearing was closed.

C. Beer made a motion to grant the waiver and approve the application subject to the recommendations on the staff memo dated 7/20/10. G. Williams seconded and all in favor.

Paul & Nancy Amato for Spring Creek Sand & Gravel, LLC/Stonewall Dr Extension – Mile Slip Rd and Stonewall Dr – Map 45, Lot 11-1. Public Hearing for a major open space subdivision creating fourteen (14) new residential lots.

Abutters present in the audience:

Anthony Tosi, 140 Mile Slip Rd

Linda Mack, Stonewall Dr

C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell noted that the application was complete, according to the staff memo. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson noted that the abutters list was the same as the previous application and the abutters in the audience have not changed. J. Langdell stated that the abutters list from the last application will stand.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Matthew Peterson, Woodland Design Group, Inc.

Paul Amato, Spring Creek Gravel

Diane Fitzpatrick, Conservation Commission Chairperson

After a brief discussion, a site walk was scheduled for 8/10/10 at 6pm. Everyone is to meet on Stonewall Dr and abutters are invited to attend.

M. Peterson then presented and reviewed the plans dated 6/21/10.

- *Sheets 3-6:* Show topography, soil mapping, test pits, reference and plan notes, the abutters and even the beaver hut.
- *Sheet 7:* Shows the standard conventional subdivision layout for fifteen lots with septic, wells, frontages, and building areas.

M. Peterson explained that this would be a nice subdivision and after working with the abutters, we made some changes to create a very nice open space subdivision. We tried to create development that, ten or twenty years from now, will not have changed the landscape much, so the six lots shown along Mile Slip Rd have been revised on the open space plan as to not see houses from the street. The flow of drainage also leads into the wetlands there and it is a huge advantage to not put houses and backyards there. Each piece of land dictates how the open space should be laid out and in this case, we tried to protect the brook. We have also been working with the abutters to address their concerns. S. Marchant confirmed that this layout meets all regulations without any waivers.

- *Sheets 8-11:* Shows existing conditions, easements, boundaries, and open space calculations.

M. Peterson said note #11 outlines the open space requirements and this project has large areas of open space off Mile Slip Rd. Fairmont Dr will have to be re-named and Blueberry Ln was revised to address some of the abutters concerns.

J. Langdell inquired about the gravel road access. P. Amato said it is currently blocked off by rocks at Mile Slip Rd and at one point it was shown as a walking trail but that didn't really work for this layout. J. Langdell noted that access to a portion of the open space would be off Stonewall Dr where it might be a little wet. M. Peterson referenced sheet 5 that showed the gravel road and the part that will be discontinued.

- *Sheets 13-16:* The topographic subdivision plans show open space areas, the steep slopes, wetlands and materials piles.

M. Peterson said the main 25% steep slopes for this project are the gulley for the stream.

- *Sheets 17-18:* The roadway layout shows the signs, radiuses, centerlines, driveways, houses, grading and clearings. We did show the fifty ft (50') setbacks as requested on the site walk with Conservation, but since they are not prime wetlands we would like the setbacks reduced to 25ft. The regulations reference the brook and "adjacent wetlands" which have not been defined.
- *Sheets 19-20:* Show the engineering and the drainage systems.

M. Peterson gave an overview of the drainage systems and noted that the biggest issue will be dealing with the water volume; the State now requires that the pre and post construction must match.

- *Sheets 21-22:* Show the erosion control.

M. Peterson said a SWPPP is required for this project and will be prepared prior to construction.

- *Sheets 23-24:* Show the roadway profiles.

M. Peterson reviewed the road grades for Blueberry Ln, Fairmont Dr and Stonewall Dr and stated that all were within the regulations.

- *Sheets 26-37:* Show site distance and drainage profiles.

M. Peterson explained that Paul has been trying to do something different for the wetland crossing. The stream is narrow and the slopes are at quite a grade so a traditional concrete span with retaining walls will be enormous and hard to maintain. This site is in the middle of the woods and is not conducive to something that large. We also looked into a covered bridge, but the costs will be high and all departments would have to buy into it. So we are proposing a timber bridge for this low volume road. A timber structure that will run across the span supported by pilings and will all be open underneath. There is one being built in Pembroke right now and the manufacturer is willing to come in and talk to all departments to discuss their questions regarding snow removal, longevity and maintenance.

K. Bauer referenced the Fire Department suggestions for fire protection and asked if there are plans for fire cisterns or residential fire sprinklers? M. Peterson said they will meet with the Fire Department to determine the best solution.

J. Langdell stated that there is a considerable list of items to be addressed, as noted in the staff memo dated 7/20/10, so at this time we should address the density and conventional/open space determination.

C. Beer said fifteen lots would be acceptable for the density.

G. Williams said he preferred the open space layout to the conventional layout. There's a more rural feel.

K. Bauer said the conventional seemed to work density-wise but prefers the more broad open space design with one less lot.

J. Langdell read excerpts from the *Zoning Ordinance 6.04.4 Open Space Design/Design Standards/List of Resources to Consider for Preservation* and said that there are certainly enough criteria here to meet those regulations, especially the water resources and the preservation of the head of Great Brook as a natural resource.

P. Amato said that the original plan had the brook within several of the lots which our ordinance allows, but after listening to the Conservation Commission last fall on how to protect the more sensitive areas of the open space, we revised the plan so that the brook is only in the open space and not in any lots. We have met their intent even though it is not required. Also, the more recently developed five acre lots with 150 ft of frontage, on the west side of Mile Slip, do not adhere to the look and feel of that road in the early years. This plan will put fourteen (14) more lots there but will not change the look of Mile Slip at all. J. Langdell then brought up a recent Board discussion regarding the character of housing in Milford for the recently updated Master Plan Housing Chapter where Mile Slip Rd was referenced as an example to question if that rural road is still rural with the current layout and frontages or is there a way to do better? Perhaps this design is a way to do better. P. Amato stated that Stonewall Dr is a great neighborhood and the abutters are right, the kids play in the streets and they have block parties. This design creates two small neighborhoods and they too will be a great place to raise a family.

C. Beer made a motion to approve the density for no more than fifteen (15) lots. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor.

C. Beer made a motion to approve the subdivision to move forward as an open space subdivision. J. Plant seconded and all in favor.

Chairperson Langdell opened the discussion to the audience.

A. Tossi asked how many lots can go in with the density approved for fifteen and the application for fourteen. J. Langdell clarified that the subdivision can have a maximum of fifteen (15) lots, and the applicant is only proposing fourteen (14) lots with the open space subdivision, but they could do fifteen (15) lots. Mr. Amato has a philosophy of giving up lots, so that would be unlikely. P. Amato added that the land supports fifteen (15) lots but we're only proposing fourteen lots unless there would have to be some major design changes.

D. Fitzpatrick explained the history of the plans and commented on their site walk. She said the commission was pleased with the overall design of this open space layout. The majority of the wetlands and the brook are in the open space areas and otherwise it's a very dry site. J. Langdell noted that Conservation had done a lot of work prior to this meeting which was very helpful and much appreciated.

L. Mack reiterated her concerns with the road cutting through Stonewall Dr and would like the road located someplace else. It surprised her to have a road going through there and inquired if any other options were discussed. P. Amato said that the original eleven (11) lot Stonewall Dr subdivision was done by the Asselin Bros, which also added more traffic past his house. From a safety standpoint, this plan will add a loop for a secondary access for the houses on Mile Slip Rd and the Mason Rd intersection. There is really only a potential for five (5) houses in the smaller neighborhood to use Stonewall Dr as an access. Anytime you add onto a dead-end road, there are abutter concerns, but if done with minimal impact no one will notice five or ten years down the road. Yes, there will be impact here, but it will be minimal. J. Langdell said that as our thoughts and technology develop, more traffic calming measures may be instituted at some point in time, if needed. As a benefit, the residents of Stonewall Dr will now have access to more green space. P. Amato added that currently all his abutters are welcome to walk his land although he tries to keep motorized vehicles out because of the horses. From a planning standpoint, the added road access is good planning. When Stonewall Dr was developed, the property line on the road went right to the end of the property and if they weren't planning for future development that line would have stopped further back. L. Mack asked what route the construction trucks would take; Stonewall Dr or an alternative route. P. Amato said the trucks and heavy equipment for the road construction would come through the gravel pit or use the road from his other property. For house construction, those vehicles could possibly use Stonewall Dr as it is a town road. L. Mack asked if there was any way the building construction traffic could use the gravel drive also. M. Peterson explained that Mr. Amato would have control of the one contractor for the road construction but he will not be involved in the home construction where there could be many different contractors.

A. Tossi expressed concern with the traffic impact at the intersection of Mason and Mile Slip Roads. J. Langdell said that is a major consideration that will be discussed as this application progresses.

K. Bauer inquired about the timelines. S. Marchant said staff will set up and facilitate meetings with the applicant, town departments and CEI, Inc to iron out all these issues and revise the plans.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the hearing.

S. Duncanson made a motion to send the plans, when ready, to CEI, Inc. for engineering review of the roadways and drainage. G. Williams seconded and all in favor.

There was a brief discussion on changing the name of Fairmont Dr and several ideas were thrown out including Elk Run. S. Marchant said to send any suggestions to the office and she will run it through the E911 maps in house.

M. Peterson stated that the applicant would like to waive the sixty-five (65) day action requirements.

S. Duncanson made a motion to waive the sixty-five (65) day requirements of the *Development Regulations Section 4.09* and to table the application to the 10/18/10 meeting. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

P. Amato returned to the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Milford Conservation Commission – Hartshorn Pond – Map 2, lot 28-2. Recommendation request.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Fred Elkind, Conservation Commission coordinator

Diane Fitzpatrick, Conservation Commission chairperson

D. Fitzpatrick said the commission was approached by Anne and Karl Zahn to do something in memory of the late Bud Zahn. They own property on the west side of Hartshorn Pond and suggested possibly donating a piece of land 100ft from the edge of the pond going west totaling approximately two acres. The Town owns the pond, the dam and the land in between Rte 13N which the Lions Club has adopted and turned into a park. Parking was put in and the intersection of Rte 13N with Hartshorn Mill Rd was redefined. Once we have the survey we will come back to the Board with a lot line adjustment. Back in March the Town adopted RSA 41:14:A, pertaining to the acquisition and sale of land which gave the Selectmen the authority to either sell or acquire land; however, they must first submit the proposal to the Planning Board and Conservation Commission. That RSA does not cover the Conservation Commission acquiring land though. RSA 41:36:A gives authority to the Conservation Commission to acquire land subject to the approval of the local governing body, the Board of Selectmen. J. Langdell said the Board appreciates the courtesy of you coming forward. D. Fitzpatrick said this donation will enhance the public property in that area and we will work out a way to get to the other side for a little stroll in the woods. D. Fitzpatrick ended a brief discussion on types of water crossings by saying they will have to watch the water level just below the dam, over the next year or two to get a first hand look at what is needed. The park area will be handicapped accessible but the other side of the pond could be a bit more of a challenge and there will not be any public access from the Zahn's adjacent property. Discussion on the possibilities for the land, including a possible picnic grove, followed. D. Fitzpatrick added that this is one of the many projects going on in town that make Milford a nicer place to live; it is a very visible area and people like to stop.

There was consensus from the Board to strongly recommend we do everything in our power to make this happen and to thank the Zahn family very much for their generosity.

Suzanne DeMontigny – Off Tonella Rd – Map 43, Lots 24 & 25. Conceptual discussion for a potential residential subdivision off the end of Tonella Rd.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Matthew Peterson, Woodland Design Group, Inc.

M. Peterson presented a conceptual plan dated 6/21/10 and described the eight lots of the subdivision that would extend Tonella Rd 675 ft. This is a beautiful piece of property with three homes on it currently. Aside from the ten acre lot that the DeMontignys would live on, the average lot size would be 35,000SF and all lots would be serviced by town water and sewer. In regards to the possible connection to Powers St suggested by staff, we would be willing to work with the Town. This is an exclusive developed area here so we wouldn't want to do a boulevard, but maybe some type of emergency access or one-way.

J. Langdell inquired if the wetlands analysis was current because there were some discrepancies with the land further west and lots 1 & 2 abut that same water source. M. Peterson said that the land was surveyed last month. J. Langdell asked how many traffic trips there would be per household. S. Marchant answered that the average was ten trips per household. J. Langdell said she had concerns with an average of thirty to fifty more trips per day at the Tonella Rd and Nashua St intersection. S. Marchant said that the Town has a relatively recent traffic study for that intersection that could be used to determine if additional trips would affect the level of service, should the applicant come back with an application. J. Langdell noted that there is a difference between the statistical patterns and grids and the operational day to day life in the town of Milford. J. Langdell asked if lot 43/3-2 was developed land. S. Marchant replied that she could pull an aerial photo or that anyone could go to the GIS viewer at www.milford.nh.gov and type in the lot number.

K. Bauer commented that the residents of Ledgewood have been pushing for an extra lane on Nashua St or some other measure to facilitate the existing traffic. S. Marchant said that Tonella Rd has recently been striped to add a turning lane and agreed that there are significant concerns from the residents, so that intersection will need to be looked at. There is also a recent traffic study from Powers St with a potential need for a traffic signal there and certainly the whole area can be looked at as well as options for a potential connection to Powers St. M. Peterson said he understood the concerns brought up and will see what can be done. Discussion followed. K. Bauer asked if the homes would be single family and what the frontages would be, especially for lots 3, 4 & 7. M. Peterson said all the lots would meet the 100ft requirements and are designed for single family residences.

P. Amato inquired where the existing road ends. M. Peterson replied that the town portion of the road ends at the edge of lot 1, but the proposed extension includes part of the existing road to almost Ledgewood Dr. P. Amato said good planning dictates that we at least show, if not build, the potential connection to Powers St. M. Peterson said that could be referenced in a note on the plan. P. Amato referenced the open space ordinance and said through practical use in this district, the lots won't change much between a conventional and open space design. This concept could be used to determine the number of lots and then be reconfigured to design better lots. M. Peterson said they will also need to look at the amount of steep slopes and wetlands for the open space calculations. P. Amato said if the design could be done to show a way to Powers St in the most appropriate area and you might not have to deal with the frontage requirements and from a planning standpoint it is important that we don't make it so cost effective because sometimes things are there on paper, but may not be practical. J. Langdell said there is a negotiating factor around what the ordinance requires, what we can do, and what is on the ground that makes good planning sense. P. Amato also asked if the telephone easement actually went through the house as shown on the plan. M. Peterson said that's what the surveyor found and he would have to research it.

G. Williams asked if it was customary to have a lot line in the water. M. Peterson said the beautiful quarry will be accessed by two lots and there wasn't really another option. S. Marchant noted that there are many bodies of water in the State where land owners' property bounds go all the way to the center of the river.

C. Beer noted that the driveway off the hammerhead would have to be relocated to meet DPW regulations.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55PM.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 20, 2010 PLANNING BOARD MEETING APPROVED AUG 17, 2010